2415

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XIV.—No. 2. NEW YORK, N. Y., NOVEMBER, 1899. Whole No. 364.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."

JOHN HAY.

Mnemosyne.

As I gazed across the village
In the downfall of the day,—
The village that I loved so well
Ere youth had passed away,—
I remembered—I remembered—
O Wind of Memory!
Why dost thou stir the glassy blur
Of a dead and bitter sea?

Ah! it was he—Great Morris—
Who knew what siren song
It were to not remember
Each dark and deadly wrong,
Each cutting lie, each false reply,
That Discord doth let slip
To part the cherished friends of youth
And the bond of Fellowship.

And yet—'twere better for the race
To suffer and be wise
Than not to still remember well
The test of truth and lies,
Than be the fey and easy prey
Of all the scattered schools,
Nor know where ignorance is bliss
'Tis folly to be fools.

William Walstein Gordak.

On Picket Duty.

If Mr. Greevz Fisher is now allowed to reiterate in Liberty the view of money which he has hitherto received abundant opportunity to express, it is simply that he may serve as a foil to Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe. Not at all do I underrate Mr. Fisher's value. He is a sincere libertarian, and does useful work for liberty in many lines, showing as a rule great originality and ability. But concerning questions of finance he is mentally blind. I am tired of repeating my answers to his oft-repeated arguments, but Mr. Donisthorpe, who always has something fresh and brilliant to say, lends so much of new interest to the subject, by his method of meeting Mr. Fisher, that the controversy is of value for these columns.

The Civic Federation of Chicago has issued its report of the proceedings of the Trust Conference held in Chicago last September. It makes a large volume of more than six hundred pages, and is sold both in cloth and in paper. Among the verbatim reports of the numerous addresses is that of the editor of Liberty,—information which I give here in response to numerous inquiries. The fact that this address will be published separately some months hence, and at a very low price, should deter no one from purchasing the full report, which is itself a remarkably cheap and a very useful book. The bound book is sold at one dollar, and the paper-covered book at fifty cents. Copies will be mailed from the office of Liberty to any address, post-paid, on receipt of price. It should be added that the work contains portraits of many of the speakers.

By an unhappy oversight Mr. Byington's signature was not appended to the first instalment of his article, "What Anarchism is Not," concluded in the present issue. I supposed that the author's characteristic style, coupled with his quotation from his previous article, "What is Anarchism?" would prevent any regular reader of Liberty from being misled by the omission into an error regarding the article's origin. On the contrary, and much to the gratification of my vanity, I have been congratulated more than once upon the assumed fact that in this article I had surpassed myself. I hasten to restore to Mr. Byington the glory of which I unwittingly robbed him for a moment. He has further cause for complaint in the compositor's substitution of "Archistic" for "Anarchistic" in Mr. Byington's quotation from himself; see September issue, third page, second column. May these errors prove blessings in disguise by inducing readers to begin the article again and follow it to the end at one sitting!

A stock company has been formed, under the title of The Tucker Publishing Company, for the publication of pamphlets and books on a large scale. It will begin its work early in February, under the business management of the editor of Liberty. Each week it will issue ten pamphlets, ranging in size from sixteen to one hundred and fifty pages or more. Most of them will be reprints of the best articles contained in the English and Continental magazines, the Continental articles being translated into English; and the range of subjects will be very wide, including economics, history, travel, biography, science, art, fiction, and *belles-lettres*. Each pamphlet will contain but a single article or essay, under a single title, and will be complete in itself, and the prices will range between three and twenty-five cents a copy. This enterprise will enable the reader to purchase for three or five cents a single article that interests him, instead of paying thirty-five, fifty, or even seventy-five cents for a magazine containing this article together with eight or nine others not wanted by the reader in question. A considerable percentage of the literature thus published will have a strongly libertarian tendency,—a fact which should stimulate all liberty-lovers to their best efforts in furtherance of the plan. Each can become individually a pronounced factor in the company's success by purchasing every week one or more of the publications through his local book-seller and by making his friends and acquaintances familiar with the company's doings. Advance circulars will be issued weekly, announcing the forthcoming works, which circulars will be mailed regularly to any address on receipt of sixty-five cents a year for weekly service, or of fifteen cents a year for monthly service.

"I am a philosophical Anarchist," said a prominent Single Taxer to me the other day,—presumably I violate no confidence in naming him: Mr. Bolton Hall—"I am even what *you* would consider an Anarchist on everything but the land question, and, in my own view, even my position on the land question is Anarchistic. Show me that taxation of land values is an aggression, and I will throw over the Single Tax without the slightest hesitation." Similarly, any advocate of compulsory Communism might say to me: "I am what you would consider an Anarchist on everything but the property question, and, in my own view, even my position on the property question is Anarchistic. Show me that universal and permanent expropriation is an aggression, and I will throw over Communism without the slightest hesitation." The trouble with this Single Taxer and this Communist is that neither perceives the correct definition of equal liberty. Both more or less confuse equality of liberty with equality in general. The Communist thinks that equality of liberty gives to each individual, by the mere fact of his individuality, a right in the sum total of brain and muscle acquired in the course of time, by inheritance or development, by all individuals. The Single Taxer thinks that equality of liberty gives to each individual, by the mere fact of his individuality, a right in the sum total of land acquired in the course of time, by occupancy and use, by all individuals. But the truth is that the equality of liberty gives to each individual nothing but security in the exercise of such brain and muscle as, by inheritance or development, he may have individually acquired, upon such raw material as, by occupancy and use, he may have individually acquired. This truth seems to me self-evident. If the Single Taxer does not see it, I cannot equip him, any more than the Communist, with the requisite power of vision. This last remark probably will be viewed by Mr. Hall as another instance of what he terms my "well-meant acerbity," which at any rate is preferable to well-meant absurdity.

Liberty.

Bi-monthly: Twelve Numbers, 60 Cents; Twenty-four Numbers, $1.00; Single Copies, 5 Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., NOVEMBER, 1899.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

What Anarchism is Not.

[Concluded from September number.]

Still, my friends will have a strong case, if they are all right about crimes of property. And I admit that, if universal Communism can be made a fact, it will apparently make such crimes impossible. Perhaps it can some day be made a fact; I absolutely deny nothing future, not even the changes of human nature. But my experience of Communist argument has not encouraged me either to believe this tenet or to dispute it; for I once tried to argue the property question in a Communist paper, and asked how it would be in an Anarchist-Communist society if one group of workers was making whiskey for drinking, and another group, holding the prohibitionist faith that the presence of a stock of alcoholic beverage is a bad thing, made a point of carting it off as fast as produced and making it all into varnish at once to prevent its being drunk. I asked whether there would be anything contrary to Anarchist-Communist principles in their action; if so, what; and what could, in conformity with Anarchist-Communist policy, be done to stop them. My respondent, J. H. Morris, promptly and frankly dodged the questions, and I must wait till I get the answer before I shall know just what Anarchist-Communism really means. They must surely have some way for people of opposite views about whiskey to live together, for of all possible effects of Anarchy on human nature the unlikeliest is that it should tend to make all men think and feel alike. Yet perhaps the Communists don't think so; for, when I expressed a doubt how Communism would supply me with my books for philological study, somebody triumphantly replied that in a condition of freedom nobody would care for such trash! With such uniformity of tastes Communism ought to be easy.

But I admit that I cannot quite prove Communism to be permanently impracticable. Yet the Communists will not be justified in their dogmatic condemnation of my utterances till they can positively prove that complete Communism is certainly practicable. This proof ought properly to be given by experiment; and here they should remember their own classic experiment of Dr. Rossi's Anarchist-Communist colony, "Cecilia." For Rossi said, after the break-up of the colony, that his experience in it left him "as much an Anarchist as ever, but not so much a Communist."

But be it assumed, for the sake of the argument, that Communism is to be the order of society; I am all right still. I was acknowledging just now that *universal* Communism would make crimes of property impossible. But the word "universal" makes my acknowledgment worthless.

For you must have a beginning of your Communism. Are you going to let your beginning wait till everybody believes in Communism? Then you may wait till doomsday; some folks will never believe till they see it working. But, if you are made of the stuff I think you are, you will begin your new social order at least as soon as you have a "working majority." Then one of the principal problems you will have to solve at first is, what to do with a large body of Commercialists* scattered in the midst of your Communist society. What will you do? Force them to give up their property and live communistically? If that is your plan of Anarchism, all I have to say now is that it requires a police. Some pig-headed Commercialist malcontents are sure, under the influence of their old prejudices against Communism, to keep trying to hold some things as their property; property-crime exists as much as ever, only it is now the crime of holding property, instead of the crime of violating it; and to keep the wealth all expropriated will require a lively police service, be it regular or irregular.

Then, perhaps, you will simply practise Communism among yourselves, and leave the Commercialists to be commercial till their prejudices have been conquered by the sight of Communism's beauties in practice. That seems to me more reasonable. But individual initiative will get you into trouble. Here is Cox, a Commercialist farmer who keeps only two hoes in use, but owns three, having bought one at an auction to be used when his oldest is worn out. Here are ten thousand Anarchist-Communists who agree to let him keep his three hoes; but the ten thousand and first man, Knox, is an extremist, who thinks that no man, whatever principles he professes, should be allowed to hold idle hoes as property. One day Knox is working in a Communist field, when a comrade breaks a hoe. Cox's barn being the nearest place where a hoe is to be had, Knox goes there, finds no person, and takes the hoe. When Cox finds this out, he, being a quick-tempered man, goes to get his hoe, and says he prefers to wear out his own hoes. Knox replies that Cox has no valid title, and they say disagreeable things before Cox takes the hoe home. On the next convenient occasion Knox takes that hoe again; Cox says he can't stand this, comes with two fellow-Commercialists, and takes Knox and shuts him up in a jail or in a spare bedroom (whichever you like), till he either thinks Knox has had enough or receives Knox's assurance that it shan't happen again.

Unless, of course, Knox is rescued; and that's the question. What do you Communists do in such a case? If you submit to Cox's action, you are acquiescing in the enforcement of Commercialist law by Commercialist police against an Anarchist-Communist comrade; the Commercialists have occasion enough for keeping up their police, not only in the cases of Knox and others like him, but in the thieves that may spring up within Commercialist society itself (you surely won't deny the ability of Commercialism to breed any required amount of wickedness); and we have all the police I talked about. But I don't believe you will altogether submit. Individual initiative comes in again. Some of you will think best to keep quiet, but a considerable number will feel bound to rescue Knox. As long as the contest lasts there will be no doubt of the "occasion for police" on both sides. And the contest must end in one of the two conditions already discussed; either the Communists coerce the Commercialists, or they admit (in practice) the jurisdiction of the Commercialist police. Or else the Communists must undertake to restrain Knox themselves, for which they need a Communist police again.

An absurd big row over a hoe, of course. But it isn't only one hoe; it is the whole question of property. If Knox is allowed to prosper peaceably in taking that hoe, and the next similar case and the next are allowed to go the same way, then Communist expropriation will drive Commercialists into Communism by wholesale against their will. At least, such is the belief of enough Commercialists to support a police force; and, as long as they believe this, they will act on it, even if their belief is ill-founded. If time and local experience prove this belief false, we may be on the way to live without police. I never said the police system must be eternal!

Perhaps somebody thinks I did say so. For a Communist paper copies my article, reprints what I said about "police, courts, and jails," but carefully cancels, as being intolerable where the rest was tolerable, the words "and such continuance is to be expected." Now, I mean to assert only that more or less of such continuance is to be expected. I take it to be a cardinal principle, in predicting the effects of Anarchy, that at first people in general will go on in the same way of living that they have been used to under government, in every respect in which this is possible under Anarchy. In the second half of the second sentence of the paragraph cited at the beginning of this article I have given the proof that in every Anarchistic society the existence of a police force must be possible; this, joined to the principle that most people will at first keep up every old custom that still is possible, forms a complete syllogism to show that at first the police will be kept up. Nothing but experience of Anarchy will show what changes will become possible when we are used to liberty.

The proof that a police will always be possible is clear and complete, I should think, in my original statement; but, if an example will make it clearer, it shall be given. Anarchy will not wait for all the world to give up the institution of marriage; Anarchy will be established while many still cling to the marriage-ideal. This will, of course, give room for jealousy under

* This seems to me the most appropriate name for those who are not Communists. It is, also, so far as I know, the name in best usage; for it is William Morris's word, and I have not read any discussion of this subject by any one else who is so acknowledged a master of perfect English as Morris.

Anarchy, even by the most ardent free-lover's showing. Now let Dove, a free-lover, and Sparrow, a matrimonialist, court the same matrimonialist girl. Distrusting all free-lovers, she accepts Sparrow. Dove is no more consoled by the possibility of getting another girl than he would be under the old order of things; finding himself shut out from the one of his choice, he goes so mad with jealousy as to shoot Sparrow. Now, Sparrow, as a conservative, had naturally been a subscriber to a police agency, which, of course, arrests Dove at once, and hangs him. Dove's friends try to stir up the people against the police as a gang of governmental murderers, who must be put down with a strong hand to realize true Anarchy. The police answer: "Either you think that Anarchism allows us to put murderers to death, or you do not. If it does, you have no cause for firing on us. If it does not, your firing on us would, in your own view, be a putting of murderers to death, and therefore you cannot attack us without, in your own view, giving up your Anarchism." That argument ought to disperse the mob, unless they are prepared to say, by word or deed: "Anarchism be hanged! We are Dove's friends, and will avenge his death," to which the police reply: "All right; we are Sparrow's friends, and will avenge our friend's death; may the best cartridges win!"

So far the police. But possibly police are all right, if they will not use jails. I don't see, though, what better thing they can use. If a man is arrested, he should have a fair trial; then he must be kept at least a few minutes till the trial can be held. He must be either locked up, or tied up, or kept under a guard's eye, for the minutes or months preceding his trial; which will he prefer? If found guilty, something is to be done to prevent a repetition of the offence. If not a term in jail, what shall it be? The whipping-post? Transportation to Africa? Death? Mutilation? Fining is good for Russell Sage, but you can't fine tramps and Communists, who have nothing to pay with.

Or shall the police confine itself to resisting the attempt of crime and recovering the amount of damage actually suffered, but never inflict punishment for a crime after its commission? That theory always attracts me, although the more I study it the flimsier it looks; but it doesn't apply here. For the jail is a means, not only of punishment, but of resistance. Suppose Dove's shot merely breaks Sparrow's rib, and Dove is seized before he can shoot again. Obviously resistance includes holding Dove till Sparrow can be got out of sight. But doesn't it also include holding Dove till he has had more than a few days to cool his passions? What sort of resistance would it be to let Dove go on the streets again next day, attempt to enter Sparrow's house (if shooting the person who opens the door will help him get in, he has no punishment to fear), or watch with another pistol for the first appearance of Sparrow's face at the window? If that is to be the rule, and if the man who seizes Dove takes a strong interest in Sparrow's safety, I think he will be likely to make a hole in Dove's skull, and then say that at the moment he did not see any other way to prevent Dove from shooting again. Men have long agreed that it is bad policy to adopt a rule which makes killing a man safer than leaving him alive.

But I have been assailed with the reproach that, wherever there are police, courts, and jails, there must also be a *law* for them to enforce. Well! "If this be treason, make the most of it." I can at least save my reputation for consistency, for I have never professed to be in favor of the abolition of law. All I ask is that the corporation called "State" shall be under exactly the same laws as private corporations * and individuals. If the law forbids me to club or jail my neighbor for not conforming to my expressed will or my ideas of propriety, let the same law forbid the State; that's enough. I have read in text books of international law that one of the distinguishing characteristics of a State is its having no law over it; what is under the law is no longer a State. I want all persons and corporations to be under the law of equal freedom, at least in their dealings with me, and to be kept to that law by appropriate force *if necessary*. And then the law of equal freedom will be a law in every known sense of that word; and the only ones who oppose all law are those who oppose this.

I am also rebuked for talking as if no Commercialist Anarchists favored violent revolution; and Dyer D. Lum and Herman Royer are named as persons who favored violence while following Liberty's principles in other respects. I suppose I ought to have known this about Lum at least; I did not. If I had known it, I should have used different language. Of course, I did not mean to say that the sentiments of all Commercialist Anarchists in the world were known to me.

To sum up my standpoint, it is this. Anarchism is not a reform of people's habits, characters, or opinions in any respect but the single one of government by force. Various such reforms may be helpful to Anarchism, if their success comes first, or may be helped by Anarchism's success, if that comes first; but they are no part of Anarchism. And Anarchy will not directly produce any of these reforms, but will only establish conditions under which the forces that cause reform can work better. In our propaganda it is desirable, in order to secure that enthusiasm which comes from a broad prospect, to show that Anarchy will thus indirectly bring about the most sweeping reforms, and will do so with a reliability of beneficence beyond what any brain can now plan. But, if we assert that wherever Anarchy exists it must necessarily be accompanied by some specified new rule of life, we shall frighten away, by misrepresenting Anarchy, every inquirer who is not willing to have that rule applied to his life. The only way to success is to keep this fact at the front: Under Anarchy you do not have to change your accustomed manner of life in any way, unless you choose, except that you must not kick your neighbor into taking care of you when he isn't willing.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

* And here I have been surprised again to see able Anarchists argue that the State is justified in kicking corporations around as it chooses, because the corporation is a mere creature of the State, the State having created it by granting the artificial privilege of suing and being sued by the corporate name instead of the names of individual corporators. Surely in a free society several persons could associate themselves for business and give notice that in all civil actions pertaining to this business, they would appear in the name of the association, but not in their personal names; then this understanding would be a part of all contracts made with that association, which would thus be a corporation. The State gives corporations their charters in precisely the same sense as Uncle Sam gives western settlers their homesteads,—that is, the State merely makes its consent necessary by forbidding them to take without its consent.

"Der Eigene," published by Adolf Brand in Berlin-Neurahnsdorf, Germany, has emerged from its late eclipse in a new form and dress, being printed from Roman type and in magazine form, and produces a pleasing effect. It aims to furnish a meeting-ground to original thinkers in the various realms of thought. A pioneer of a neo-Hellenic civilization, the "Eigene" champions a state of society in which Mrs. Grundy and the policeman's club will not suppress and destroy individual peculiarity and character. It stands for the free activity o the individual, unhampered by any authority, because this offers the surest guarantee of the evolutionary and peaceable new-ordering of things which will enable each to become happy in his own way. Its aim is the greatest possible welfare of all. The title of the magazine is taken from Stirner's book, and is perhaps best rendered in English by "The Sovereign." (We have no equivalents for *der Einzige* and *der Eigene* in English, but the things for which these German terms stand are as much in evidence among Anglo-Saxons as among Germans.) The two July numbers of the new series of "Der Eigene" contain poems, short stories, essays on philosophical and economical subjects, and literary and art reviews of a high order, such as are not often found in reform publications. Advanced and enlightened views of love, as well as the love celebrated in Plato's "Banquet," receive artistic treatment in poem and story. In one of the essays the teachings of Stirner and Nietzsche are subjected to criticism and further development. In an essay on "Social Evolution" Hermann Krecke considers present economical phenomena in the light of evolution, and concludes that the present order, in which the many toil for the benefit of the few, will necessarily be superseded by a co-operative order, in which all will share in the wealth they help to create. The writer of this essay is plainly concerned about individual sovereignty, but gives precedence to society, in the sense of Spencer, though he does not mention the English philosopher. The closing pages of the magazine deal with literary and art matters from the view-point of "Der Eigene."

Recently I was telling a friend of the enthusiastic reception of my address before the Chicago Trust Conference. "This simply proves," said he, in comment, "the truth of what Henry Appleton said to me years ago,—namely, that you may say the most radical things and win eager acceptance, provided you do not label them, but that, the moment you label them with an offensive name like Anarchism, you drive everybody away from you." "Yes?" said I; "well, unhappily for Mr. Appleton's view, Anarchism was the first word of my speech, it was the last word of my speech, and it recurred constantly throughout my speech. Never was doctrine so distinctly

labeled. And it is my opinion that, had it not been so distinctly labeled, it would not have commanded one-tenth the attention that it did." "Why, then, the facts *refute* Mr. Appleton's theory," said my friend. "Precisely," said I. There is a lesson here for the numerous libertarians who think it unwise to use the term Anarchism. The real trouble with them is that they have not the courage to say, either in public or private: "I am an Anarchist." And it doesn't take much courage either. On the rare occasions when they succeed in screwing up their courage, they look around after the terrible words have fallen from their lips, astonished to find that the planetary orbits are where they were before.

Mr. E. B. McKenzie, in sending to me lately for some copies of "The Wind and the Whirlwind," joined to his order the following comment: "The whirlwind seems to have struck, not on the tearful Nile, but on the tearful Modder and Tugela." This caused me to read afresh Blunt's wonderful poem, and I assure all libertarians that it will pay them to do likewise. I reproduce a few stanzas which, in the light of events now transpiring in South Africa, seem indeed prophetic.

Oh insolence of strength! Oh boast of wisdom!
  Oh poverty in all things truly wise!
Thinkest thou, England, God can be outwitted
  For ever thus by him who sells and buys?

Thou sellest the sad nations to their ruin.
  What hast thou bought? The child within the womb,
The son of him thou slayest to thy hurting,
  Shall answer thee 'an Empire for thy tomb.'

Thou hast joined house to house for thy perdition.
  Thou hast done evil in the name of right.
Thou hast made bitter sweet and the sweet bitter,
  And called light darkness and the darkness light.

Thou art become a bye word for dissembling,
  A beacon to thy neighbors for all fraud.
Thy deeds of violence men count and reckon.
  Who takes the sword shall perish by the sword.

Thou hast deserved men's hatred. They shall hate thee.
  Thou hast deserved men's fear. Their fear shall kill.
Thou hast thy foot upon the weak. The weakest
  With his bruised head shall strike thee on the heel.

Thou wentest to this Egypt for thy pleasure.
  Thou shalt remain with her for thy sore pain.
Thou hast possessed her beauty. Thou wouldst leave her.
  Nay. Thou shalt lie with her as thou hast lain.

She shall bring shame upon thy face with all men.
  She shall disease thee with thy grief and fear.
Thou shalt grow sick and feeble in her ruin.
  Thou shalt repay her to the last sad tear.

Her kindred shall surround thee with strange clamors,
  Dogging thy steps till thou shalt loathe their din.
The friends thou hast deceived shall watch in anger.
  Thy children shall upbraid thee with thy sin.

All shall be counted thee a crime,—thy patience
  With thy impatience. Thy best thought shall wound.
Thou shalt grow weary of thy work thus fashioned,
  And walk in fear with eyes upon the ground.

The Empire thou didst build shall be divided.
  Thou shalt be weighed in thine own balances
Of usury to peoples and to princes,
  And be found wanting by the world and these.

They shall possess the lands by thee forsaken
  And not regret thee. On their seas no more
Thy ships shall bear destruction to the nations,
  Or thy guns thunder on a fenceless shore.

Thou hadst no pity in thy day of triumph.
  These shall not pity thee. The world shall move
On its high course and leave thee to thy silence,
  Scorned by the creatures that thou couldst not love.

Thy Empire shall be parted, and thy kingdom.
  At thy own doors a kingdom shall arise,
Where freedom shall be preached and the wrong
    righted
  Which thy unwisdom wrought in days unwise.

Truth yet shall triumph in a world of justice.
  This is of faith. I swear it. East and west
The law of Man's progression shall accomplish
  Even this last great marvel with the rest.

Thou wouldst not further it. Thou canst not hinder.
  If thou shalt learn in time, thou yet shalt live.
But God shall ease thy hand of its dominion,
  And give to these the rights thou wouldst not give.

Listen to this "rabid" and revolutionary talk from Prof. William G. Sumner, one of the pillars of *bourgeois* individualism and sham economic liberty: "The great foe of democracy now and in the near future is plutocracy. Every year that passes brings out this antagonism more distinctly. It is to be the social war of the twentieth century. In that war militarism, expansion, and imperialism will all favor plutocracy. In the first place war and expansion will favor jobbery, both in the dependencies and at home. In the second place, they will take away the attention of the people from what the plutocrats are doing. In the third place, they will cause large expenditures of the people's money, the return for which will not go into the treasury, but into the hands of a few schemers In the fourth place, they will call for a large public debt and taxes, and these things especially tend to make men unequal, because any social burdens bear more heavily on the weak than on the strong, and so make the weak weaker and the strong stronger." This is said apropos of expansion and imperialism, but it is significant that it is said at all. It was true two years ago, when no one dreamed of external depotism, but Prof. Sumner did not see it, and treated with scorn the men who saw and said it. Verily, recent events have opened the eyes of people in quarters from which the brotherhood of thieves derived aid and support. Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin indulges in expressions identical with those of Sumner. He, too, has discovered the menace of plutocracy, the conspiracy of aggressive monopoly. But how long will they stick to their "un-American" and revolutionary position? How consistent will they be in warring upon plutocracy?

Far from realizing the hope expressed in the last issue that I should be able to make up some of the time lost by the delay in the appearance of that issue, I am much later with the November number than I was with the September. This is due to the unexpected prolongation of a trip through New England and the middle West, undertaken by me in furtherance of an important business project announced in another paragraph. If the project is fulfilled to the extent of its initiator's expectations, it will contribute powerfully to the more regular publication of Liberty in the near future, as well as to many other useful ends.

After February 1 the office of Liberty will be in the business office of The Tucker Publishing Company, Park Row Building (opposite the post office), Rooms 2128–29–30–31, on the twenty-first floor.

Mr. Auberon Herbert's Fetich.

[Wordsworth Donisthorpe in Free Life.]

Mr. Auberon Herbert insists on the right of self-ownership. He claims the right to own himself. I dispute it. I cannot see upon what the right is based. Of course, if he says it is based on the same grounds as that upon which the right of the English to England is based, I admit his claim. He *does* own himself, and there the matter ends. But the niggers on the old plantations had no right (no legal right) to self-ownership, nor to any other ownership, *as all admit*. The abolitionists appealed to me—that is, to the community—pointing out that it would be better for me—that is, for the general public—that the slaves should be set free. I saw the force of their arguments, and agreed; not because the niggers had any right to their liberty, but because I thought that in my interest that right should be conferred upon them. I deny the right then claimed for them, and I am delighted that they enjoy it now. I ask Mr. Herbert not to assume his right to own himself, but to *prove* that he ought to have it. And the only way to prove this is to show that *I* shall benefit by conferring the right on him. I believe this proof to be an easy task. But why shirk it? The reason seems to be this: just as mankind is supposed by some to be entitled to greater veneration if regarded as the degenerate successors of a perfect pair pitchforked into the planet, rather than as the final outcome of the purifying struggles of evolution, so rights are believed to be more acceptable and more proof against attack if regarded as having dropped from some mysterious astral region rather than as being the resultants of countless forces contending for countless ages. If evolution cannot carry us on its shoulders right through the cosmos (and I believe it can), let it be relegated to Jupiter and Saturn, along with political economy and teleology and alchemy and astrology and all the theories of jumps and cataclysms. Mr. Herbert and the Absolutists irresistibly recall to my mind the luminous discourse of St. Augustin on the perfect number. Said he: "There are three classes of numbers, the more than perfect, the perfect, and the less than perfect. . . . Six is the first perfect number. Whereupon we must not say that Six is a perfect number, because God finished all his works in six days; but that God finished all his works in six days, because six is a perfect number." Exactly. Similarly Mr. Herbert says: "Liberty is not a right because it is good for mankind; it is good for mankind because it is right." Though why we should fall down and worship either a Right or a Perfect Number, St. Augustin and Mr. Herbert leave us to conjecture.

A Friend of Truth.

[Jean Julien in L'Aurore.]

The work of the sculptor Crépon consists of a sort of *alto-relievo* and several groups detached therefrom. In the background, and not very clearly indicated, are enormous factory buildings, and in the foreground, through the wide-open gate, rushes a furiously-hustling crowd of females,—emaciated girls, young women with hollow cheeks, older women shrunken and worn by too hard work and too many pregnancies. This swarming of sad creatures is called "The Sortie." At the left a group of aged women, shriveled and misshapen, waiting against a wall; at the right an elegant young lady, also waiting, crouching in a *coupé*,—these complete the *ensemble*.

The importance of the work attracts the saunterers in the Salon of the Champ-de-Mars, but they quickly go away, indignant at the bitter truth of the scene as well as at the idea of revolt which it conveys. They ask themselves how it is that such a horror was accepted; these women are monsters,—enough to give one a nightmare. A certain critic pretended that to model so much hideousness was to debase art; and a well known personage cried out that such an exhibit of our social sores must be the work of some bad Frenchman, some man without a country.

It is not to be doubted that the Chambières family would have shared the aversion of the public, had they not been amateurs desirous of being up-to-date; but such people have to smother their personal preferences. It had been whispered to them that Crépon perhaps was a fellow of talent; nothing more was needed to make them go into ecstasies over "The

Sortie," and declare it admirable. Let no one talk to them of allegory or symbolism; the only beauty in art lay in realism, truth!

Where did Crépon hide himself? They wanted to discover him. They intended to receive him, to invite him to their table, to show him to their friends, to launch him, and to hasten his fame and glory. The sculptor was reluctant and stubbornly defended himself, having no time to parade before wealthy *bourgeois*. But, weary of resistance, he finally said to the Chambières' messenger:

"They want me, they shall have me; and, since they love truth, it shall be served to them."

The day had come, and it was even past the dinner hour. The guests assembled in the *salon* of the Chambières were beginning to get impatient, and a vague disappointment was already perceptible on Madame's face, when suddenly a discussion was heard, which seemed to come from the kitchen, and these words were uttered in a tone of obstinacy:

"But don't I tell you that I am invited?"

They went to investigate. There was Crépon, in his working clothes, daubed with plaster and clay. The concierge had shown him up the servants' stairway, and he was trying, in spite of the domestics, to open a way for himself to the *salon*. Apologies were offered for the misunderstanding; he heeded them not.

"Of course you understand," said he, "that it would have been easy for me to hire an evening suit, but, since I was to be the guest of a friend of truth, I thought it useless to disguise myself."

"You were perfectly right," said Chambières, smiling.

The sculptor's costume, at first looked upon as indecorous, became an artist's agreeable caprice, and, Crépon offering his arm to Madame, they passed into the dining room.

"Oh! oh!" he exclaimed, after having tasted of it, "what the devil have they put into this soup?"

One by one the guests protested; they found the soup very good; some even asked for more. Only one old man declared it a little bitter.

"The cook," continued Crépon, "must have mistaken the aloe box for the salt cellar. At any rate I am sure that I have the approval of our host in frankly calling attention to the matter."

Although M. Chambières regarded the sally as a playful one, he saw fit to turn the conversation in another direction, and declared the great admiration of all for the young master's *chef d'œuvre*.

"You astonish me," replied Crépon; "it was not my purpose to please the *bourgeois*."

"We are able to admire talent wherever it may show itself."

"Is that why you have given the place of honor in your drawing-room to a reproduction of Lavardin's 'Bathers,' certainly one of the most contemptible pieces of work ever seen?"

"Lavardin is a friend of ours."

"That excuses you; but surely you will not think that I acted improperly in telling you sincerely what I thought of him." . . .

"It is certain," declared Madame, "that Lavardin's bathers scarcely resemble the working-women of your 'Sortie.' It is difficult to imagine a more complete collection of superb frights."

"What do you expect, Madame? It is the lot of the working-women. If they did nothing from morn till night, perhaps their hands would be as plump and their faces as round as yours; but fancy these unfortunates after ten, perhaps twelve, hours' work, and you will admit that I could not make them pretty, since they are lamentable."

"Undoubtedly they are; only it seems to me that in the hell which you offer us you might have placed a corner of heaven. Why, for instance, does the little lady in the *coupe* hide herself in the depths of her carriage? Would it not be nicer to see her smiling at the window and distributing alms to all these wretched women?"

"It would be very nice, but it would be very false. The little lady in question knows beyond a doubt that alms are no longer of any use; in this sortie from the factory she foresees the grand sortie of the rebels, and she is afraid."

"Evidently it is very faithful, very true, taken from life; yet" . . . .

"A little compromise would not displease you?"

"Precisely; and I hope that next year you will give us a *chef d'œuvre* not quite so cruel."

"Something after the manner of Lavardin's 'Bathers?'"

"My wife is right," said Chambières; "in all things the end must be considered. Your great piece at the Salon is good; and yet it is not just the thing. Who would buy your 'Sortie'? Not an individual; not the State; it could not figure in a gallery or in a museum; of course your interest requires you, while respecting the truth, to make nevertheless some concessions."

"Madame admires the true art, but prefers the false through taste; you prefer it through interest. Provided one makes money, all else is of small consequence; how well I understand why you have become rich!"

"We are not talking of myself, or of my riches. It is your success alone that we are considering. Monsieur," he added, designating a guest who was an official, "will tell you, as I tell you, that in life" . .

"I care as little for the opinion of officials as for that of soldiers and priests; they are not producers, they know nothing of life."

Murmurs were heard among those at table; Chambières rose.

"Monsieur Crépon, you go too far; I could smile at your witticisms, excuse your ironies and your sarcasms, when they were aimed only at me; but I will not tolerate attacks on my friends in my own house."

"I thought I was the guest of a fanatical devotee of truth. Pardon my error; I retire."

"Before the truth, Monsieur, there is politeness, propriety, tact, delicacy, good taste, good education, and a multitude of other things which a well bred man knows and of which you are ignorant."

"Then because you force me to come to your house and present me at dinner, I must compose an attitude, consider my language, disguise my thoughts, deny my convictions, admire Lavardin, and poison myself without saying a word? I am beginning to believe that, though you honor truth, you practise falsehood."

"It remained for you only to call me a liar! Know, Monsieur, that I am an honest man!"

"They all believe it; that is the distressing feature of the matter."

After the artist had disappeared, M. Chambières turned to his guests with much dignity, saying:

"I apologize to all of you; I was mistaken; this fellow has no talent."

Anarchism at the Trust Conference.

The following newspaper comments on the address delivered by the editor of Liberty before the Chicago Trust Conference were crowded out of the last issue:

The splendidly-delivered arguments of Benjamin R. Tucker, the New York theoretical Anarchist, furnished the sensation of the afternoon. His analysis showed the four kinds of special privileges which permitted the development of trusts on such an immense scale. Little changes in society, he argued, could never abolish these privileges. The Anarchistic principle must be applied—the principle of the equality of liberty to all—and by this means competition would be made fair and free, or otherwise the trusts would continue to develop their monstrous system of inequality.—*Chicago Times Herald.*

The world does move. Among the manifestations of its progress furnished by the Central Music Hall conference is the broad spirit of tolerance in which Benjamin R. Tucker's speech was received. Mr. Tucker represents a mental tendency to be described as Anarchistic. His speech was a plea for Anarchy as a solution of current evils. He is an intelligent man, resourceful, well informed, logical in method, and wedded to his idea. A few years ago he could not have had a hearing in any such assemblage as the one that has been discussing trusts, but Thursday night people listened with interest to what he had to say. That indicates a healthier condition of the public mind. When people are ready to inquire, they are in a position to learn and to progress. Nobody need accept any more of an Anarchist's views than he likes, but, when men refuse to listen to any person whatever for fear they might hear something disagreeable, or repugnant to their accustomed modes of thought, they are almost certain to cut themselves off from something that is valuable. There is as much narrowness and bigotry in the field of politics as in the field of religion. Most men inherit a set of political notions from their fathers, and try to make them fit the conditions of their later day. The ancestral idea is apt to be at least one generation behind the times, and is often worse than that. It usually expresses itself in the shape of adhesion for life to some political party, and in sailing along with it, like a barnacle on a ship's bottom, into whatever port the pilot may choose to steer for. They may diminish the speed, but they don't change the direction. It is a healthy symptom when men are so interested in knowing where they are being taken that they are willing to listen to those who have something to tell them about it. They may hear a great many false warnings and a great deal of bad advice, but, if they are fit for governing themselves, they must hear for themselves, and do their own judging.

It is unlikely that Mr. Tucker won many adherents to his theories, but the reception of his address denoted the inquiring mind on the part of the audience. There is nothing, not even the doctrine of Anarchists, that reasoning beings can afford to dismiss without investigation, when it comes their way.—*Chicago Journal.*

The "Commercial" said two weeks ago that it did not look for any beneficial results from the Chicago Civic Federation's Trust Conference. Events have justified us in that conclusion. The delegates almost immediately got into a wrangle, which neither the eloquence of Bourke Cockran nor the aptitude of college professors as pacificators was able to abate. This is exactly as we expected it would be, and, moreover, it arises from the very causes which we predicted would create dissension. No assembly in which conservatism and Anarchy both have equal voice can quietly carry out any prearranged programme. It is a long reach from Chauncey M. Depew, the senator, to Benjamin R. Tucker, the iconoclast, who believes that the salvation of mankind depends upon the suspension of all law. In passing, however, we might remark that Tucker seemed to have a clearer conception of what he was there for than any other member of the convention. The paper he read was an able one from his standpoint, and some of his utterances, standing alone, would subject him to the charge of being a trust emissary. He held that the right to co operate, which is but another name for combining, is as unquestionable as the right to compete; that the right to compete involves the right to refrain from competition, and competition is always a method of co-operation; that each is a legitimate, orderly exercise of the individual will; and that any man or institution attempting to prohibit or restrict either, by legislative enactment, or by any form of invasive force, is, so far as such attempt goes, an enemy of the human race. This is sound doctrine, no less sound coming from an Anarchist, than it would be embodied in a judicial order.—*N. Y. Commercial.*

Irrelevancies.

I want a vocabulary for the new order of thought. I do not know how to get along without the word "soul" or "spirit"; and yet I do not see that there are souls and spirits apart from the *tout ensemble* of the beings we call men and women. "Large souled," "whole souled"—what is to be in place of these? I do not even see clearly how I can escape talking about good men and bad men. In a sense, perhaps, everything is a matter of taste; but I am not quite content with a word used principally to distinguish bread from toast. The German student after the duel bears the dressing of his wound with the same fortitude exhibited by Rakhmétoff in his night of voluntary torture on his bed of iron nails. I admire the strength of endurance in either man, but I have not the same admiration for both. With the student I could enjoy more whining, if there might be less duelling. And I am not quite at peace with the theory that the difference between the two men is a difference of taste. I find myself always returning to a half-acknowledged desire to talk of Rakhmétoff as a man with more soul. "Quality," "calibre," "texture"—none of these will quite do. Can't we keep the word "soul" to distinguish between what we are when the machinery is in motion and what we shall be when it is at rest?

BERTHA MARVIN

The Home as a Corrupter of Manners.

All who have not read G. Bernard Shaw's two volumes of "Plays, Pleasant and Unpleasant," should hasten to do so. And let them not omit the prefaces. The plays are good, but the prefaces are better. Here is a taste of one of them:

If, on any night at the busiest part of the theatrical season in London, the audiences were cordoned by the police and examined individually as to their views on the subject, there would probably not be a single house-owning native among them who would not conceive a visit to the theatre, or indeed to any public assembly, artistic or political, as an exceptional way of spending an evening, the normal English way being to sit in separate families in separate rooms in separate houses, each person silently occupied with a book, a paper, or a game of halma, cut off equally from the blessings of society and solitude. The result is that you may make the acquaintance of a thousand streets of middle class English families without coming on a trace of any consciousness of citizenship, or any artistic cultivation of the senses. The condition of the men is bad enough, in spite of their daily escape into the city, because they carry the exclusive and unsocial habits of "the home" with them into the wider world of their business. Although they are natural, amiable, and companionable enough, they are, by home training, so incredibly ill-mannered that not even their business interests in welcoming a possible customer in every inquirer can correct their habit of treating everybody who has not been "introduced" as a stranger and intruder. The women, who have not even the city to educate them, are much worse; they are positively unfit for civilized intercourse—graceless, ignorant, narrow-minded to a quite appalling degree. Even in public places homebred people cannot be taught to understand that the right they are themselves exercising is a common right. Whether they are in a second-class railway carriage or in a church, they receive every additional fellow-passenger or worshipper as a Chinaman receives the "foreign devil" who has forced him to open his ports.

In proportion as this horrible domestic institution is broken up by the active social circulation of the upper classes in their own orbit, or its stagnant isolation made impossible by the overcrowding of the working classes, manners improve enormously. In the middle classes themselves the revolt of a single clever daughter (nobody has yet done justice to the modern clever Englishwoman's loathing of the very word "home"), and her insistence on qualifying herself for an independent working life, humanizes her whole family in an astonishingly short time; and the formation of a habit of going to the suburban theatre once a week, or to the Monday Popular Concerts, or both, very perceptibly ameliorates its manners. But none of these breaches in the Englishman's castle-house can be made without a cannonade of books and pianoforte music. The books and music cannot be kept out, because they alone can make the hideous boredom of the hearth bearable. If its victims may not live real lives, they may at least read about imaginary ones, and perhaps learn from them to doubt whether a class that not only submits to home life, but actually values itself on it, is really a class worth belonging to.

Misdirected Criticism.

[Monterey Globe.]

The very rapid accumulation by large wealth of larger wealth strikes the public consciousness in a noticeable way. In nothing is this more manifest than in the remarks often made when a millionaire gives a conspicuous sum to charity or education. Take as a specimen of comments seen and heard the following from the Beaumont "Journal:"

Millionaires who endow aristocratic colleges are eulogized as philanthropists. In such cases the American people are prone to look no farther than the deed. Their eyes are dazzled by a gilded generosity that touches a naturally grateful heart. Is it not possible, however, that each one of these dollars so lavishly bestowed was accumulated at the expense of miserable, ill paid toilers? The gifts may equip laboratories and purchase libraries for a selected few, but in the acquisition of wealth the philanthropic donor may have consigned hundreds to the darkness of ignorance. Men may purchase knowledge, power, and admiration, but hypocritical philanthropy can never wash the stain from a dollar coined in blood.

It is possible that the dollar is accumulated at the expense of an ill paid toiler, but this does not alter the fact that it is lawfully the dollar of the millionaire, and, now that it is his, he can employ it in either of several ways. He can hoard it, and stint labor of employment. He can engage in productive enterprise, thus circulating the dollar. He can endow a college, thus adding to the capacity of mankind by education. Or he can sink dollar and self-respect in merely personal indulgence. When the rich man spends his money wisely and kindly, he should be decently commended. Perhaps he realizes that he is only a cog on the great wheel of man. He did not invent the inequalities and hardships of the social system, but had to choose between pursuing gain by the means indicated in all his surroundings, and not taking up such opportunity, but leaving it to another, who would probably make his million and endow nothing. It is a harsh way that the "Journal" has fallen into this once, qualifying philanthropy and acquisition as it does. Suppose we named the richest man in America, who gives large sums to education. He really could not have altered anything by keeping out of Standard Oil, only that he would have had less money and somebody else would have been in the position he now occupies. There certainly is no more hypocrisy about the very rich man who makes a million at a stroke than there is about the milkman who visits the well before he makes his early morning trip to the city—perhaps less; and the "bleeding" condition has been arranged by so many circumstances of ignorance, prejudice, and folly that it would require a book to analyze them. Some writers leave the impression that the world is to be improved by individuals acting differently to what they do, from individual motives, while conditions are the same; paying higher wages as employers, refraining from speculation, and so on. This is childish simplicity. No individual can alter the condition of industrial society by putting his shoulder against the fly-wheel. He can possibly do some good by aiding education. He has a right to express his nature in humane acts in any direction, and such acts merit approbation. The bitter style of comment is likely to prove hurtful to mankind because it makes for armed socialistic revolution, and that would obscure the problem and delay the evolution which may bring about a better general understanding.

Mr. Donisthorpe on Currency.*

To the Editor of Liberty:

As usual, Mr. Donisthorpe treats his subject most clearly; his essay sparkles with lucidity, and cannot fail to assist in dissipating some of the fog which in many minds surrounds the question of money. Nothing can be more exhilarating than Mr. Donisthorpe's vigorous denunciations of the mischief of government-meddling with monetary usages, or than his inspiriting defence of freedom as the best method of regulation of these, as of other, human interactions.

It is, nevertheless, allowable to express dissent from some of the views put forward as to the defects and possible remedies in the monetary system.

Mr. Donisthorpe in two places asserts that it would be illegal in England to issue ounces of tin with the name or device of the guarantor and the quantity of metal they contain stamped upon them. Is it possible for Mr. Donisthorpe to be mistaken upon this point? Can he, on reference to the statutes, show that the sale of a piece of metal described, not as a pound, shilling, or penny, or their plurals, but as a specific quantity of the metal they contain, is contrary to English law? Any one can weigh up butter, bread, and possibly cloth, leather, etc., with trade marks and other devices of guarantors stamped upon their surfaces, and with the quantity or measurement also specified. This is something more than packing goods in papers and tins trademarked and quantified. Bundles of sheet metals, and single sheets, are actually sold bearing the vendor's marks of nomination and quantity, and contracts to deliver these at future dates must surely be valid. Can it then be possible (though the law is an ass) that ounces of metals other than those requiring a plate-dealer's license are prohibited from being sold and resold, bartered, owed, and paid, if there were any utility derivable from the process? This freedom would not extend to agreements as to wages forbidden by the truck acts. No one wants to circulate one-ounce coins of block tin. They are unsuited for currency. This leads to the question: Is Mr. Donisthorpe sound in his application of the word currency? Is it conformable with that usage of this term which really determines its meaning to apply it to commodities as equivalent to *salability*—which is, in effect, what Mr. Donisthorpe does? Some term would be useful to denote things which are (if any ever are) bought and sold, not for themselves, but as a means of selling and buying the other things which are given and received for the former. One carries a gold quarter ounce—a sovereign—as the most salable of all one's possessions, which, as it were, contains a surplus of salable force capable of being liberated instantly, at will, when the owner desires to purchase some consumable utility, such as a silk hat, a railway ride, a lunch for a small party, or what not. The vendors of these *fruenda* do not buy the gold coins as *fruenda*, but as currency. They do not place the coins in their windows marking their value in terms of the articles they desire to buy. They know that the reverse process will operate. By looking about they will probably discover people who will offer to buy gold with those very things which they require, and to these people they sell their gold. Some advertisements may be regarded as offers to sell gold. All these cases, however, but illustrate what, indeed, Mr. Donisthorpe eagerly adopts, later in his article—that most of the exchanges of various commodities habitually involve as one term a valuable of a special and tolerably definite class. This class is generally, but loosely, spoken of as money. The term money is, however, properly and usefully limited to the monetary commodity (or commodities). The class of valuables under consideration is accurately designated as currency, and there does not seem to be much to gain by so enlarging the scope of this term as to render it a mere synonym for salables in general. Its employment in this sense leads Mr. Donisthorpe to discuss the availability of various valuables as currency, where it would probably have been shorter and more accurate to examine them as excluded and more or less remote from currency. Their unsuitability as currency arises, in fact, from inferior salability.

"Pianos and patents for unproved inventions are most inefficient as currency," says Mr. Donisthorpe. Does he not virtually admit that, owing to this inefficiency, they are excluded from employment as currency, and that on this account they are, as a matter of fact, not any portion of "the currency" of any market. Valuables the most "available" as currency are used as and are currency. Other valuables are not so used, and are not currency. "We might divide valuables into currency and not-currency," writes Mr. Donisthorpe. He ought not to characterize this classification as "misleading," but as useful, sound, and valid.

The customary use of the term is too strong and too useful for Mr. Donisthorpe, as he shows by his admission that "practically it denotes those things which are, as a fact, used as a medium of exchange," and his own usage in other places. Thus he says: "People do not want State checks payable in gold. They want a cheap currency—silver money." Here it is evidently implied that unmonetized silver is not any part of a currency, but that people, in Mr. Donisthorpe's opinion, want silver to be coined so that it may fall into the class currency from which it is now excluded. Again, the expressions are used: "Substituting a gold for a silver currency," "Why do not the Chinese . . . adopt a gold currency?" and the term is repeatedly used in the same restricted sense in the passages just following the above-quoted phrases.

Currency is, in reality a mass of valuables actually in frequent operation for the purpose of effecting the distribution of other valuables rather than their own. All exchangeable valuables are media of exchange. Exchange is a process for creating utility by the mutual movement ultimately of commodities and services from each of two parties to whom they are respectively less useful, less valuable, to each other of the same parties to whom they are respectively more valuable, more useful to their possessors, and, after it, they are of greater utility to their present possessors.

* This article accompanied the manuscript of Mr. Donisthorpe's article in the September number, but, because of its length, had to be held back. Mr. Donisthorpe's rejoinder will appear in subsequent issues.—*Editor Liberty.*

Thus their utility is increased by the act of exchange. But currency may, by a slight, but pardonable, paradox, be said to consist of a mass of valuables whose own utility is least affected by exchange,—a class of valuables, in fact, which may slightly lose its value in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely-increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question. The hatter wants a pound's worth of beef,—that is to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quantity of gold. The butcher, however, does not now want a hat for his own use, and knows that a hat for sale in his hands will be misplaced, by reason of his want of skill as a hat merchant and want of a stock from which to enable a casual customer to select. But neither does he now want gold to use as a trinket. Nor does the hatter. Gold in the hands of either is no nearer the consumer. In fact, it may be further from the consumer whose appetite for gold-pleasure alone gives it its ultimate value, and gives it all the value it ever possesses. But it pays each of these traders to proceed as they usually do. The butcher will not supply the hatter with meat until he can offer a quarter ounce of gold (he does not give credit, or he distrusts this hatter, or fears to trust him further). The hatter exercises his skill as a distributor so as to treat with a gold-holder to whom a hat is more valuable at the moment than a quarter-ounce of gold or any other thing which he can buy with it, and who, therefore, gains by purchasing the hat. Availing of this opportunity, he purchases the gold, for which he has no use whatever, in order to sell it to another who has equally no use for it, each relying upon the gold-appetite of unknown people, remote probably in time and space, to maintain the value of the gold in the world's market, so that, owing to this and its other special qualities, it will at all times possess such superabundant salability that the utility resulting from its displacement from its normal course—the direct track from producer to consumer—shall more than compensate for the actual reduction in its value owing to such deviation. It is normal for commodities to possess least value to their producers and most value for their consumers, and to gain in value as they are sold and conveyed nearer and nearer to the consumer. To this gold is no exception. If a gold-miner buys gold, he allows it to move contrary to its normal economic tendency, and it lowers in value. He may remunerate himself by the normal economic movement of a much less salable valuable. The gain in salability of his wealth by this conversion may be a greater value than that which the gold loses. This is an example of currency. Currency consists wholly of valuables of such superabundant salability that all traders (and nearly all mankind now are traders) can afford to hold a certain quantity of them for the mere purpose of possessing this (may it be called?) "explosive" salability, which can be instantly discharged upon any attractive offer of other valuables.

The general view that a certain aggregate value of currency is a requisite of the world's market, which view Mr. Donisthorpe adopts, may be accepted. Does it lead to Mr. Donisthorpe's view that a large proportion of it might usefully consist of silver quantatively coined in terms of its own weight?

The total value of the retail or fractional currency of any area would probably not differ very widely from, say, a fortnight's wages. It can hardly be supposed that a five-shilling silver coin is a very necessary or useful piece as an element of this currency. Two half crowns seem to possess every useful quality of the five shilling coin, save one—ease in counting, while they add a much more important utility—divisibility. The silver crown pieces are not fatally awkward, or they would be as little used as the £5 gold coins, and would not come into circulation. Ten-shilling silver pieces would not circulate at all. Under freedom probably a half ounce coin of a value in metal of about one shilling would be most required. When picking out coins (for change, etc.) from a heap, the largest available for the particular payment are first taken. This act supplies the motive power for circulating large, in preference to small, coins. It is the recipient of the coins who has to study whether the value is so great as to be inconvenient in subsequent purchases and payments, owing to the expected payments being small and change being regarded as scarce.

Mr. Donisthorpe's argument in favor of perfect freedom to coin silver and all metals are, on the whole, most valuable. The position he takes up is unassailable here. But liberty would not limit itself to a power to issue ounces of silver and their fractions. It would contemplate with equanimity the competing issue of tokens named in terms of the superior money of the district, if any. It cannot be conceded that Mr. Donisthorpe's theory that the circulation of the former would supersede or prevent the latter is necessarily correct. Every individualist will assent to the view that the evils or disadvantages arising from their competition would be more than compensated, in various ways. Liberty would enable the markets and force the issuers automatically and continuously to correct and improve the money or tokens. Gresham's law as to the superior potency of inferior money applies only to fiat made money. It is singular that Mr. Donisthorpe should hold the views that at present the government, by means of the Mint and Bank of England, has so forced silver into circulation that this same Bank of England is "choked with the rubbish." The very machinery by which silver coins can alone be forced into circulation are all open to the Bank of England, and it can (so it is said) obtain from the Mint new silver coins, by tale, for worn ones. It has only itself to blame, if it holds an excess. The Bank of England is said to act in the same way for the other banks, and, in fact, accept silver from them at its face value. There is no outcry of a glut of silver by banks in general. If this be so, one part of Mr. Donisthorpe's argument against token silver falls to the ground. But, as to the inducements to counterfeiting the coinage trade-marks of the government, he is unimpeachable.

It is, then, necessary to discuss his views as to the economic effects of freedom where he supposes:

(1) That silver could, and probably would, exist as money side by side with gold;

(2) That this would be beneficial?

It is surely desirable that Anarchists and Individualists should hold, and should in argument employ, sound views, and it is therefore desirable that their views should be sifted and proved.

The essence of the monetary invention is the discovery of *one* commodity which can usefully be introduced, either directly or by promise, into every act of exchange. It is almost axiomatic that money is impaired by duplication, which is nearly synonymous with duplicity.

The highest development of money for large transactions is attainable only when contracts to deliver money are as precise and as definite in their terms as they can possibly be made. In the arts various materials and various qualities or compounds have each their special applications. All are subservient to human appetites, which are, in their turn, subservient to the requirements of life), and economics as well as industrial development depend upon the possibility of each person finding it at times agreeable and ultimately beneficial to surrender one pleasure to gain another and a different pleasure. Whether it be in wines, fruits, colors, textiles, carriages, coal, bricks, metals, or what not, one is exchangeable for the others, but each has a special function which no other can completely fulfil.

Gold is not a substitute for silver, nor is silver a substitute for gold. When exchange alone is considered, it may appear as though any quantity of one material may at a given moment be exactly equivalent to some quantity of another; yet, when it comes to applied utility and the direct or indirect ministration to some appetite, it is found that each has its own demand, and it is the impossibility of substitution, coupled with the variations of supply and demand, which lead to fluctuations in the ratio of value. These natural causes lead to fluctuations in the value of all commodities relatively to each other. It never can be different with the ratio in the value of gold and silver.

A contract to supply a gold vessel or a quantity of gold leaf cannot be fulfilled in silver. It may be possible to estimate practically the damage sustained by one who is injured by the failure of another to fulfil the contract as drawn, but that is quite another matter. A contract to deliver value at a future time which gives the payer the option as to which metal he will deliver is less valuable, and one giving the payee the option of electing which he will have is more valuable, than one definitely drawn to secure payment and satisfaction involving one definite act.

As all contracts are more beneficial to both parties in proportion as their terms are unambiguous, so it can hardly be doubted that under freedom there would be but few in which these options were allowed.

If freedom were to be achieved, and notes issued in terms of both silver and gold, a reserve of each would have to be independently provided, or—what is more probable—either would suffice for the other by the allowance of the current margin for variation in value.

But all this would not make the slightest, or at most would make an almost infinitesimal, change in the value of either, and it would not relieve the existing money famine, because no such thing exists. The quantity of true silver coins which would circulate in England would not undergo any perceptible alteration in consequence of allowing all to compete in issuing them. In every branch of trade there are forces at work tending to cause any one to hold the smallest possible stock of any material, save only such as are expected to rise in value. This holds good of money. The currency cannot involve or support more than a certain value of money and promises. Mr. Donisthorpe observes that processes operate whereby the utmost possible number of silver tokens are forced upon the people. Does he believe that he would habitually have in his own house, or in his own purse, a larger value of silver money, if full value coins were obtainable, than he now holds of the token coins? What would he do with them? Would he so replenish his stock as to keep it constantly up to a much larger quantity than he now habitually holds? Does he know any person, or class of persons, who would probably act in this way, and does he know why they would do it? Can he explain this to his readers?

It may be that Mr. Donisthorpe will argue that honest silver ounces will run abroad. But why should they? Or what great good would result, if they did? Would they displace certain foreign silver coins, and would this do us, or any one, any good? Would they be hoarded in India, and would this assist currency pressure here or elsewhere?

Would honesty and freedom of coinage, among other things, admit Mexican dollars largely into English currency? By the way, why could they not now be dealt in in England? They are quoted, bought, and sold in the bullion market. Why should not goods be offered for them? Any real demand for silver coins by weight could be satisfied by circulating these, which are ready to hand.

Mr. Donisthorpe argues that the refusal to mint silver in terms of itself, and the prohibition of such coinage by private enterprise, has had and has the effect of lowering its value, and he holds that, by so coining it, or allowing it to be coined, its value would be greatly enhanced. All this is pure fallacy, founded upon unsound analogy. The *mere* adoption of a substance as currency has none but the very smallest effect upon its value. The infinitesimal effect which is produced by its currency is not caused by withdrawing from the market the metal carried in purses, stored in safes, and reserved by banks to enable them to redeem their promises to pay it. This metal is not really withdrawn from the market at all. It is constantly in the market, purchasing other goods and selling itself.

The unsound analogy is exemplified by Mr. Donisthorpe's arguing that, if wooden wheelbarrows were prohibited and the use of aluminum ones enforced, the cost of navvying would be increased; and further, by arguing that this phenomemon is analogous to the prohibition of real silver coins, and the enforcement of the use of gold ones.

The effect of enforcing the use of aluminum wheelbarrows would ultimately be to submit aluminum to abrasion in the process. The transfer of aluminum to this purpose, even if we suppose millions of tons to be transferred, would not permanently enhance the cost of navvying, except in so far as the interest upon the value of this metal would exceed that of the wood. It is not easy to say how this item affects the cost of goods whose production and distribution is operated under a gold currency. The demonetization of silver

would not annihilate all the gold above ground. The stock would have to be carried by some one. If its value were greatly reduced, the interest lost in holding it would be proportionally reduced, but, whatever it was, it would have to be borne by some one. This, it may be supposed, would have to be paid by the users of gold in the arts.

But to perform the monetary operations necessary to production would, as Mr. Donisthorpe properly admits, require the employment of as great an aggregate value, no matter what be the material in currency.

Up to this point Mr. Donisthorpe apparently relinquishes his first contention, and, in fact, leaves it as though it were futile to introduce it. Ought he to have done so, or ought he to have returned to his example and detected its fallacy? Let it be supposed that aluminum wheelbarrows cost ten times as much as wooden ones, and that they last one hundred times as long. The navvy contractor would have to find more capital before commencing his work, but he would ultimately be well paid for it. The principal element in the actual cost of any form of currency is not the cost of the investment, but is the consumption of the metal by abrasion. The loss of interest is reduced by the mechanism of credit, but is not affected by changing the metal. The wheelbarrow analogy is not very helpful.

No one disputes the necessity for a fractional currency. This, however, hardly touches the question of the effect upon their values of substituting one metal for another in currency. The silver using countries which accept gold loans and agree to pay interest in gold—whether the investment be in their government funds or in industrial enterprises, such as railways, water-works, etc.—to this extent adopt a gold currency. The process of changing their internal currency to a gold basis would probably not be at all so momentous as is generally supposed.

If an Indian railway having to pay its interest and dividends in gold wishes to obtain its fares and freights in terms of the same metal, how is it to set to work? It has a number of expenses and wages to pay its staff and to native dealers. It can imitate the British government and issue tokens of considerable value, or it can issue paper fractions, or (though this is not, in the circumstances, probable, as it is to be presumed that the company desires to eliminate from its operations the effects of the relative variations of the values) it may issue silver coins of full value in terms of gold at present market value. The condition under the last arrangement would be practically identical with the present. Either of the two former, so far as the working of this railway was concerned, would be a complete monetization of gold, and a more or less complete demonetization of silver. But it would not draw a great quantity of gold from the bullion stores and bring it into circulation. Nor, if all the silver-using nations were to adopt this course, could it operate at all as Mr. Donisthorpe supposes. The very facts which he adduces as to the poverty of the nations prevent the possibility of their currency absorbing a very great volume of gold. A voluntary issue of tokens could never be depreciated. Competition among the issuers (bidding both for the capital, which they would obtain free of interest, and for the gains of selling tokens, many of which would never be presented for redemption) would operate to make them as valuable as compatible with a living profit.

The mere demonetization of silver by Germany was not the cause of the breakdown of the ratio. It was the discontinuance of the Latin Union's practice of maintaining the ratio by dual minting. Germany's action had a violent temporary effect, but could not have any permanent effect. The continuance by the Latin countries of free mintage in face of the great silver flood would to them have been disastrous.

There is no resemblance between money and wheelbarrows. The consumption of metals in shop weights and two foot rules is more analogous to the employment of metals as currency or as standards of currency. The world's stock of gold and silver has to be maintained as a safeguard against scarcity and a moderator of fluctuations. It might just as well be in purses, safes, and banks as in bullion stores. The currency does not absorb the whole, nor does it diminish the stock. It merely breaks up a part of it into a multitude of small stocks. Neither does circulation of a metal as currency form a *demand* for it which can affect its value. The employment of any commodity as current money is absolutely dependent upon its being a vital utility, and its value, both in and out of money, is wholly regulated by the demand or appetite for it in the arts.

It is true that it wastes slightly in the handling and passing of the coins. This loss does not fall upon the gold consumers, though it does affect its value so far as it goes; being itself a true, but small, consumption, it has its real, though diminutive, effect upon the value. But this consumption by abrasion has to be paid for in the value of the commodities which are economized, and therefore in a sense produced, by the substitution of gold in the exchange.

Exchange necessitates wealth. Credit, if perfect and universal, would enable exchanges to be carried on in the advance of the accumulation of any stores. The hunter and the weapon maker might exchange their promises in the morning and their products in the evening without any accumulation. But commerce would then be but rudimentary. In order to secure commerce in a useful and economic form, people must be able to attend a market prepared to buy, and yet in a position to decline to do so if desirable. A farmer who takes his produce to market to buy gold and with it purchase ploughs is poorly off if he is compelled to accept a temporarily depressed value owing to a sparse attendance of buyers. Equally the implement dealer may lose heavily if forced to sell. But sales of money are, of all, the least affected by waste through deterioration and transport. It may be said that gold can be sold much more than twice as often as most ordinary commodities with far less loss. It therefore pays to sell one commodity and buy gold, then to sell gold in buying a second commodity, rather than attempt to sell the first commodity directly for the second. But all the parties are all the time leaning upon the gold consumer as the one who will, in the last resort, confer value upon the gold by taking it up off the market, not with the object of reselling it on the first opportunity and lowering its value as much by its sale as he raised it by its purchase, but who will pay for the pleasure of consuming it.

What then would the advantages of liberty be in relation to currency? They would be great, but not at all overwhelming. They could only remedy evils which exist in consequence of State action. These, from an economic point of view, are not at all so great as many Socialists, Anarchists, and Individualists imagine, at least in England. The main advantage would be in disabusing the public mind of the opposite superstition that State interference is very good and absolutely necessary. The fact is that it is no good at all. Equally is it the fact that its present meddling in England is small, and of small consequence economically.

Money has been compared to a road which, though it takes up land which would otherwise be productive, yet contributes to production. This analogy is a fairly good one. The economic gain from money would be more closely paralleled, if it were possible to make all roads in all parts of the Kingdom out of lands held unproductively, awaiting purchasers. It is supposed, and is partly true, that of pig-iron, coal, cloth, and numerous other materials and commodities great stocks are always held quite unproductive and merely awaiting sale. These operate merely as a safeguard against famine, dearth, and panic. Their maintenance involves a loss of interest, which is paid for by the security it confers. Portions of any of these stocks might be brought into currency, were it not that most are too bulky and others possess other qualifications. The use of these portions could be had for next to nothing.

Gold is in a precisely similar position, and its use as money is also had for next to nothing—nearer to nothing, in fact, than any other. The infinitesimally small cost of gold currency, apart from transport, is composed in the main of abrasion. If Jevons be correct in placing this at two and one half per cent. in fifty years, it amounts to replacement in two thousand years, and is scarcely calculable in the costs added to production through the handling of money.

J. Greevz Fisher.

What is Anarchism?

An explanation by Stephen T. Byington. 5 copies for 2 cents, 50 for 10 cents, 150 for 25 cents, 700 for $1. Postage paid. Address Stephen T. Byington, P. O. Box 1312, New York City.

State Socialism and Anarchism

HOW FAR THEY AGREE, and WHEREIN THEY DIFFER.

By BENJ. R. TUCKER.

The opening chapter of "Instead of a Book" reprinted separately. The best pamphlet with which to meet the demand for a compact exposition of Anarchism. 83 pages. Single copy, 5 cents; 10 copies, 28 cents; 100 copies, $2.40. Postage included. Mailed by the publisher,

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

A Blow at Trial by Jury.

By BENJ. R. TUCKER.

An examination of the special jury law passed by the New York legislature in 1896. A speech delivered by the editor of Liberty at a mass meeting held in Cooper Union, New York, June 25, 1897, under the auspices of the Central Labor Union, Typographical Union No. 6, and other labor organizations. Distribution of this pamphlet among lawyers and legislators will tend indirectly to interest them in Anarchism. 48 pages. Single copy, 5 cents; 10 copies, 28 cents; 100 copies, $2.40. Postage included. Mailed by the publisher.

Benj R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of

BENJ. R. TUCKER,

Editor of Liberty.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well printed, and excessively cheap volume of 524 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Cloth, One Dollar; Paper, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

CHARLES A. DANA'S PLEA FOR ANARCHY.

PROUDHON

AND

HIS "BANK OF THE PEOPLE."

BY CHAS. A. DANA.

Being a Defence of the Great French Anarchist, Showing the Evils of a Specie Currency, and That Interest on Capital Can and Ought to be Abolished by a System of Free and Mutual Banking.

Price, 10 Cts.; Leatherette, 25 Cts.

THE THIRTY-SIX TRADES OF THE STATE.

BY

ARSENE ALEXANDRE.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. Showing the State as a jack-at-all-trades and good at none. Single copy, 3 cents; 10 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 80 cents. Postage included. Mailed by the publisher,

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

The Ballad of Reading Gaol.

BY C. 3. 3.—OSCAR WILDE.

A poem of more than 600 lines, dedicated to the memory of a trooper of the Horse Guards who was hanged in Reading Gaol during the poet's confinement there. An English classic.

Cloth, $1.00; Paper, 10 Cents.

The cloth edition has covers of blue and vellum, and is beautifully printed from large type on hand-made antique deckle-edge paper. It is a sumptuous book of 96 pages, and should be in every library.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GOKDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by

Benj. R Tucker, Box 1312, New York City.